UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,940	06/29/2006	Moshe Basol	7044-X06-007	2604

27317 7590 01/21/2010
Fleit Gibbons Gutman Bongini & Bianco PL
21355 EAST DIXIE HIGHWAY
SUITE 115
MIAMI, FL 33180

EXAMINER	
ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/596,940	**Applicant(s)** BASOL ET AL.	
	Examiner KAVEH ABRISHAMKAR	**Art Unit** 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 November 2009_.

2a)□ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)□ This action is non-final.

3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _2-10 and 12-28_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _2-10 and 12-28_ is/are rejected.

7)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)□ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)□ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:

1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _8/25/2009_.

4) □ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) □ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 5, 2009 has been entered.

1. Claims 2-10, and 12-28 are currently pending consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 5, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding claim 21, the Applicant argues that the Cited Prior Art (CPA), Wood et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. US 2004/0210711), does not disclose that one or more processes are associated with a session identification code. This argument is not found persuasive. The CPA discloses session continuity in which each interaction (process) between the entity and the information environment has a session credential associated with it (paragraph 0045). Therefore, each successive interaction and/or on the change of a credential level, will issue a new session credential (session identification code) to the process (paragraph 0045).

Regarding the new claims 23-24, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach a process which is created by a process operated by the original session. This is not found persuasive. The subsequent interactions after the original session is created are each created by the first process (of setting up the session) and therefore are interpreted as child processes created by a first process (paragraph 0045). Therefore, the arguments are not found persuasive and the rejection is maintained and applied to the new claims as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US 2004/0210771).

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 24:

Wood discloses a security system for real time monitoring and controlling of communication sessions within a network server environment (“Providing a persistent session in a networked information environment includes associating a unique session identifier with a set of access requests originating from a client entity and maintaining the unique session identifier across a credential level change" See paragraph 11), wherein each original session enables operating a sequence of processes including operations carried out in the server environment ("Session continuity means the maintenance of coherent session state across one or more interaction between an entity and an information environment." See paragraph 45), the system having at least one server ("A secure information system includes plural information resources host on one or servers coupled via a communication network to a client entity." See paragraph 15) enabling to communicate with a multiplicity of client users ("Client Browser" See fig. 1 ref. no. 170 and "In general a wide variety of entities, including human users operation browser and/or non-browser client applications as well as automated agents or systems, may interact with enterprise applications and/or resources 190 and the security architecture as described herein." See paragraph 41) via at least one communication network ("Communication network" See paragraph 15), wherein each client user enables accessing portals and operating sessions in the portals ("A variety of information resource identification schemes, such as by Uniform Resource Locator (URL), resource address, identifier or namespace designation, may be employed." See paragraph 41), and at least one module operated by the at least one server ("Gatekeeper," "Log-In," "Authentication," "Authorization," "Identification," and "Session" See fig. 1 ref. nos. 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, and 160), wherein the at least one module enables associating a session ID to the original session of the client user ("If no session token is present or if a session token is invalid, gatekeeper/entry handler component 110 establishes a new session." See paragraph 47) and to each process in the sequence of processes operated by the original session, ("Gatekeeper functionality (e.g. in gatekeeper/entry handler component 110) checks whether a session is already associated with the incoming request." See paragraphs 44-47) wherein the session ID enables determining an authorization level ("Authenticated Trust Level" See paragraph 46) of session in accordance with predefined determination rules ("The mapping of login credential types and authentication mechanisms to trust levels is influenced by environment information such as time of request, source of request, connection speed, and/or client application (e.g., browser) environment information." See paragraphs 37-38), where the determination rules refer to the properties of the original session ("Security requirements are expressed in terms of trust levels and login component 120 obtains login credentials for an entity requesting access to one of the enterprise applications and/or resources 190." See paragraph 35), wherein each session ID is related to the manner in which the client user has operated the original session ("The login credentials obtained are selected from a set of credential types that, if authenticated are sufficient to achieve the trust level requirement of an application or information resource to be accessed." See paragraph 35), wherein each process in the sequence is associated in real time with the same session ID of the original session enabling the module to continuously monitor operation of each process of each client user ("In the case of a pre-existing session, the signed session credential may be obtained using a received session token." See paragraph 48), while the at least one server enables operating the processes of each original session according to the authorization level related to the session ID ("Authorization component 140 may base its allow, redirect, or refuse response on a current trust level previously associated with the signed session credentials." See paragraph 48). Furthermore, it also teaches associating the session identification code of the communication session at least to a child process (paragraph 0045: wherein the subsequent interactions after the original session is created are each created by the first process (of setting up the session) and therefore are interpreted as child processes created by a first process) and each child process is operated at the authorization level of the session credential at the time of the last credential change (see paragraph 0045).

Regarding Claims 2 and 12:

Wood discloses a filtering module installed at the at least one server for blocking unauthorized processes in accordance with determined authorization level ("Authorization component 140 responds with an allow, redirect, or refuse response based on the sufficiency of a current trust level." See paragraph 48).

Regarding Claims 3 and 13:

Wood discloses at least one agent installed on the at least one server, the agent enable correlating between processes and sessions on different servers ("Gatekeeper and entry handler component 110 provides an entry point for external client applications requesting access to enterprise applications and/or resources 190, including e.g., information resources 191, 192, 193, for which access management is provided by the security architecture." See paragraph 33).

Regarding Claims 7 and 17:

Wood discloses the identified session properties are sign in parameters ("Login component 120 operating in conjunction with gatekeeper/entry handler component 110 and other components of the security architecture, provides a single sign-on interface for access to enterprise applications and/or resources 190." See paragraph 35).

Regarding Claims 9 and 19:

Wood discloses the identified session properties are hyperlink session address type parameters ("In some configuration, information on line speed, origination point (e.g., inside or outside of a corporate network), browser type, encryptions capability, number of hops latency, system type, etc. may be gather." See paragraph 43).

Regarding Claim 10 and 20:

Wood discloses the original session is identified according to a unique Transmission Control Protocol port ID ("For network connection, similar environment information may be obtained from incoming requests themselves or based on a particular entry point (e.g. a particular router or port)." See paragraph 43).

Regarding claims 25 and 26:

Wood discloses producing a hierarchical structure of processes at the kernel level (paragraph 0045) and referring to each process to the hierarchical tree said each process belongs to (paragraph 0045: wherein the subsequent interactions after the original session is created are each created by the first process (of setting up the session) and therefore are interpreted as child processes created by a first process) and each child process is operated at the authorization level of the session credential at the time of the last credential change (see paragraph 0045).

Regarding claims 27 and 28:

Wood discloses that the sequence of processes creates an additional process, and the additional process is associated with the session identification code (paragraph 0045: wherein the subsequent interactions after the original session is created are each created by the first process (of setting up the session) and therefore are interpreted as child processes created by a first process) and each child process is operated at the authorization level of the session credential at the time of the last credential change (see paragraph 0045).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wood et al. (US 2004/0210771) in view of Carter et al. (US 2003/0051026).

Wood discloses the above stated security architecture for providing access to enterprise applications and resources based on a session token’s current trust level (See paragraph 35).

Wood does not disclose each process has a process information vector wherein the session ID of the original session is added to the process information vector of each process in the sequence related to the original session.

Carter discloses a network surveillance and security system for monitoring and protecting a computer network that uses a process identification vector to associate a user ID with a unique process ID (See paragraph 342 and 363).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the security architecture disclosed by Wood to include using a process identification vector to associate a session ID with a unique process ID such as that taught by Carter in order to enable the utilization of matrices to track and control information and processes (See Carter paragraph 339).

Conclusion

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAVEH ABRISHAMKAR whose telephone number is (571)272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/K. A./
01/15/2010
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431